

Serial No. 10/797,504

**REMARKS**

The Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief mailed April 28, 2006, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-86 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-81 are allowed. Claims 82 and 86 stand rejected. Claims 83-85 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application herein in light of the proposed amendments to claims 82 and 86.

Applicants propose to amend claims 82 and 86 to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as lodged in the Final Office Action and as explained in the Advisory Action. Applicants could not have proposed this amendment earlier, as the Final Office Action merely rejected these claims as unclear and cited certain clauses therein.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claims 82 and 86 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

“The test for definiteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is whether ‘those skilled in the art would understand what is claimed when the claim is read in light of the specification.’” *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 806 F.2d 1565, 1576 1 USPQ2d 1081, 1088 (Fed. Cir. 1986); M.P.E.P. § 2173.02.

Claim 82 as proposed to be amended recites, in part, a method for singulating a semiconductor die from a semiconductor wafer that includes cutting a plurality of trenches across the wafer at substantially the same time, or concurrently, with a plurality of lasers. Either the wafer or the plurality of lasers is then rotated perpendicularly to the direction of *relative* (as amended) travel between the plurality of lasers and the semiconductor wafer and a second plurality of trenches is cut.

Serial No. 10/797,504

One skilled in the art would understand what is claimed in independent claim 82 when the claim is read in light of the specification and the drawing. *See, e.g., ¶ [0042-45]; FIG. 7.* Among others, ¶ [0042] states,

“Where the streets form a conventional grid pattern across the semiconductor wafer 100, the bank A of lasers 200 may be traversed across the wafer 100 along a first directional path... Subsequently, when cuts have been made along all parallel streets 104, the semiconductor wafer 100 may be rotated 90° using wafer holder or chuck 210 about a vertical axis perpendicular to the plane thereof (or the bank of lasers 200 rotationally moved 90° to traverse a second directional path perpendicular to the first) and then traversed across the semiconductor wafer 100 to make a second series of cuts, perpendicular to the first series. *Of course, it will be appreciated that the semiconductor wafer 100 may be moved or translated relative to the bank of lasers 200 instead.*” (emphasis added)

Taken together, one having ordinary skill in the art would understand from ¶ [0042] the following: (1) either the bank of lasers *or* the wafer may be moved, *i.e.*, *either* the plurality of lasers moves *or* the wafer moves, not both. Stated differently, *either* the bank of lasers *or* the wafer undergoes a direction of travel relative to the other; (2) the plurality of lasers are disposed in a row perpendicular to the direction of relative travel between the plurality of lasers and the wafer; (3) the plurality of lasers cuts a plurality of first trenches as either the wafer or the bank moves relative to the other, and; (4) a second plurality of trenches cut perpendicular to the first cut is made after either the plurality of lasers or the wafer is rotated 90° relative to the first plurality of trenches. Therefore, because claim 82 satisfies the standard for definiteness that the Federal Circuit set forth in *Orthokinetics, Inc.*, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 82 is respectfully requested.

The withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 83-85 is respectfully requested as each depends either directly or indirectly from now-allowable independent claim 82, among other reasons.

Claim 86 recites, in part, a method for singulating a semiconductor die from a semiconductor wafer that includes cutting through the semiconductor wafer body with a plurality of lasers disposed in a row that is perpendicular to the direction of relative travel between the wafer and the row of lasers. The lasers cut through a trench formed in the wafer in a single pass.

**Serial No. 10/797,504**

The wafer or the plurality of lasers is rotated perpendicularly to the direction of relative travel and additional cuts are made along at least some others of the plurality of streets by the lasers.

For the reasons set forth above vis-à-vis independent claim 82, one skilled in the art would understand what is claimed in independent claim 86 when the claim is read in light of the specification and the drawing. *See, e.g.*, ¶¶ [0042-45]; FIG. 7. Therefore, because claim 86 satisfies the standard for definiteness that the Federal Circuit set forth in *Orthokinetics, Inc.*, the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 86 is respectfully requested.

#### **Objections to Claims 83 through 85/Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 83 through 85 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The indication that claims 83-85 recite allowable subject matter is appreciably noted, but because each depends either directly or indirectly from now-allowable independent claim 82 no amendments have been made to the claims.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Claims 1-16, 18-24, and 78-86 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Serial No. 10/797,504

Respectfully submitted,



Craig Buschmann  
Registration No. 57,829  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: May 12, 2006

CB/sfc:eg

Document in ProLaw